



Meg Dunn, Chair
Alexandra Wallace, Vice Chair
Michael Bello
Katie Dorn
Kristin Gensmer
Per Hogestad
Kevin Murray
Mollie Simpson

City Council Chambers
City Hall West
300 Laporte Avenue
Fort Collins, Colorado

The City of Fort Collins will make reasonable accommodations for access to City services, programs, and activities and will make special communication arrangements for persons with disabilities. Please call 221-6515 (TDD 224-6001) for assistance.

Video of the meeting will be broadcast at 1:30 p.m. the following day through the Comcast cable system on Channel 14 or 881 (HD). Please visit <http://www.fcgov.com/fctv/> for the daily cable schedule. The video will also be available for later viewing on demand here: <http://www.fcgov.com/fctv/video-archive.php>.

Regular Meeting April 18, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Wallace, Hogestad, Gensmer, Simpson, Dorn, Bello, Murray
ABSENT: None
STAFF: Bzdek, Bumgarner, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

No changes to posted agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None

● **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None

● **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2018 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the February 21, 2018 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 21, 2018 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the March 21, 2018 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

3. 524 WHEDBEE STREET - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to add a rear, 1 ½ story addition to the residence. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

APPLICANT: Alison Johnson, ABD.

Ms. Wallace moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 8:0.

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

4. MCMILLEN-PATTERSON PROPERTY 121 NORTH GRANT - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the McMillen-Patterson Property, an excellent example of an Eastlake-style home from the late 1880s.

APPLICANT: Susan Hoskinson, Owner

Chair Dunn recused herself from this item.

Vice Chair Wallace acted as Chair for this item.

Ms. Gensmer disclosed she was not present for the work session, but had reviewed the recording and is prepared to participate in the discussion.

Staff Report

Ms. Bumgarner presented the staff report. She provided some background on the property, its architectural style and features, and explained staff's rationale for recommending landmark designation of the property.

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Hoskinson, the homeowner, spoke to the Commission about the landmark application. She expressed appreciation for the City Historic Preservation staff and the State Historical Fund for supporting the Loomis Addition survey, which was a key factor in her decision to apply for landmark status.

Public Input

Ms. Humstone, the consultant who prepared the application, thanked Ms. Hoskinson and her family for their dedication to this historic resource. She noted that this will be the second home in the Loomis Addition to be designated.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray commented that this a “no-brainer” for designation, and added that the inside is as well-kept as the outside.

Ms. Dorn thanked the Applicant for bringing this forward and recommended she apply for future financial incentives.

Acting Chair Wallace asked if the Commission members had any comments about the property’s significance under Standard A. She also asked staff if they had considered significance under Standard B. Ms. Bumgarner said the Commission could consider Standard B at their discretion. Ms. Gensmer supported designation under Standards A and C alone, but stated she would not object to adding Standard B, if other Commission members felt strongly about it.

Acting Chair Wallace asked the Commission if they agreed with that the property has retained all aspects of exterior integrity, and everyone agreed that all seven aspects were intact.

Ms. Simpson asked about the location of the additions to the home, which Ms. Bumgarner pointed out in the back of the home. Acting Chair Wallace noted that the additions were done with great sensitivity to the original architecture, and are not easy to spot.

Commission Deliberation

Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission pass a resolution recommending that City Council designate the McMillen-Patterson Property at 121 N. Grant as a Fort Collins Landmark in accordance with Municipal Code Chapter 14, based on the property’s significance under Standards A and C; under A for its history in the development of the Loomis Addition and its use as a show home in the marketing of one of the earliest neighborhoods in the City, and under C for its design as an Eastlake style residence, and also finding that it retains a preponderance of exterior integrity.

Ms. Simpson seconded. The motion passed 7:0.

5. 903 STOVER – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for repair of damaged material on the front porch of the residence, a drainage mitigation solution to prevent future damage, and preparation and painting of the repaired porch and the entire residence.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Karen and Timothy Bren

Chair Dunn returned to the meeting.

Mr. Murray recused himself from this item due to a conflict.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She described the property and its significance under Standards B & C for which it was designated a landmark. She discussed the proposed alterations. She described Staff’s findings of fact to support approval of the alterations. Ms. Bzdek reminded the Commission that they are in a conceptual review until they determine they are ready to move to final review. Finally, she reviewed the questions and conditions the Commission brought up at the work session, and explained the applicant and contractor responses.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Bren addressed the Commission, commenting on the condition of the porch and emphasizing the need for drainage mitigation.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Hogestad said that power washing at 1000 psi would blow holes in the wood, and that 30 psi is probably more accurate. Ms. Bzdek said that was likely in error, adding that the contractor had

characterized the strength of the spray as that of a soft rain, safe to spray at a person. Mr. Bello said the power washing was probably the right methodology, as long as it is not actually 1000 psi. Mr. Bren stated that the contractor had told him it was 1000 psi when it leaves the hose, but not when it reaches the home.

Ms. Simpson asked where the moisture on the porch goes currently. Mr. Bren explained that the water accumulates in the front corners. The purpose of the vent is to create increased evaporation.

Mr. Hogestad asked exactly where the vent would go. Mr. Bren was uncertain of its exact location. Mr. Hogestad expressed concern about how much historic material will be removed to install the vent, adding that installing it above the cleat would be preferable. Mr. Bren replied that they will try to keep it "as is" as much as possible.

There was discussion among the members that they were not ready for final review without more details about the psi and the positioning of the vent. Mr. Hogestad said it was unfortunate that the contractor was not present to provide clarification. Ms. Bzdek said the contractor had stated he would cut the vent in the vertical wood section right at grade, not above the cleat. Mr. Hogestad and Ms. Simpson noted that the drawing does not portray that, making it difficult to approve.

Chair Dunn asked Mr. Yatabe if the Commission could provide a report of acceptability with conditions. Mr. Yatabe said he was not seeing any provision for the imposition of conditions of approval on a report of acceptability. Regarding whether the Commission can move to final review without all the information, he said that would depend on the vote on the motion.

Chair Dunn asked if someone wanted to make a motion to move to final review. Mr. Hogestad restated that there are two pieces of missing information: the psi and the vent positioning. Ms. Gensmer and Ms. Wallace agreed that the Commission needed more information on those. Chair Dunn suggested the contractor come to the next meeting.

Ms. Bzdek asked for clarity on what the Applicant needs to bring to the next meeting. Chair Dunn asked for the exact psi of the power washing, and detail about the cut for the vent. Mr. Hogestad said more specifically that they need an elevation drawing of where the air vent will be placed, and an accompanying section to show what material is being affected by it. He said they would also like to know what psi pressure range is standard for power washing historic buildings, and whether the proposed power washing will meet that standard.

6. 1501 PETERSON – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for new storm and screen units in the first and second stories.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Sally and Robert Linton

Mr. Murray returned to the meeting.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She discussed the property's designation under Standard A, reviewed the proposed alterations, and explained that the window work would be accomplished in phases. She addressed the questions the Commission had asked during the work session, and outlined staff's findings of fact.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Linton, the homeowner, thanked the Commission for their important work, and thanked Ms. Bzdek for her assistance. He explained the reasoning for doing the work in phases.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray brought up the psi for the power washing of the windows, and suggested testing the power washer on a piece of wood before using on the windows.

Mr. Hogestad asked if the Commission is only considering the work for Phase 1 at this time, and not any of the carpentry work. Chair Dunn answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Murray asked about the clips on the storms. Mr. Linton said the current hanging systems will be replaced with like mechanisms, identical to those that were there in 1918. He explained that the window systems are necessary to facilitate ventilation and efficiency of cooling and heating without removing and replacing the storms with the seasons.

Chair Dunn asked about the mechanism, and Mr. Linton and Ms. Bzdek clarified that it is a hinge, not a crank, and would not be seen from the exterior. Mr. Murray asked for a drawing of the system.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern about how the system fits in the space, and the thickness of the assembly. Mr. Linton explained that Phase 1 includes the exterior storms only, and Ms. Bzdek clarified that the porch windows and mull cap will not be dealt with in Phase 1. Mr. Murray said he supports the storm windows, but needs to understand the system. Mr. Linton said there would be no variations in the interior depth. Mr. Murray said it sounded like a storm/screen combination. Mr. Hogestad said the Commission needs to see a cut sheet with detail on the entire assembly and how it is mounted.

Ms. Simpson asked if the screen was hidden when the window is closed, and how it interacts with the opening and closing of the window. Mr. Linton said his contractor would need to answer that.

Mr. Hogestad said he needs to know more about the windows. Mr. Murray stated that he trusts the contractor, Mark Wernimont, to know what he's doing, but would still like to see the system and more information.

Mr. Hogestad stated he doesn't think the sections are correct, and suggested the contractor revisit them. Mr. Murray proposed that the Commission wait until the next meeting, when they can have more information. Chair Dunn said they need the contractor to provide the cut sheets and the psi for the power washing. Mr. Hogestad added that they need more detail about the depth of space for assembly to fit and how will it fit without removing stops or doing carpentry work on the historic fabric.

7. 223 WILLOW - CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposed 5-story, multi-family apartment project at 223 Willow in the River District. The current use of this 2.04-acre lot is industrial, storage, and truck parking. It is bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad on the south.

APPLICANT: Katy Candau, Oz Architecture

Ms. Simpson disclosed that her firm is working on another project in the area, but does not believe this creates any bias.

[Secretary's Note: Throughout the meeting, the Giddings Machine Shop at 401 Pine Street is also referred to as Bas Blue or the machine shop; and Ginger and Baker at 359 Linden is also referred to as the Feeder Supply.]

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report, describing the location and the proposed area of adjacency for this proposed development. She described the architectural features of 200 Jefferson, which is a contributing building to the National Register Historic District. She also provided information about 401 Pine, which is a local landmark. She discussed the questions from the work session. She also referenced the correspondence received about his project, and the Applicant's response.

Applicant Presentation

Eduardo Illanes of Oz Architecture gave the Applicant presentation. He discussed the redevelopment of the area. He talked about the adjacent buildings, and pointed out the ways in which the proposed project complies with the guidelines for the River District in Section 4.17 of the Land Use Code. He mentioned the importance of maintaining and respecting the urban grid. He explained that the site is broken into two buildings to articulate the visual connectivity to Pine and the alignment of the Depot as the focal point. He discussed the mass of the buildings and how they step into the river and the street.

He talked about how the project relates to pedestrian connectivity, and creating gathering places with community pocket parks.

He talked about compatibility with the character of the adjacent buildings, stating that the project relates to the machine shop in terms of height. He pointed out the community green space in the design.

He stated the buildings hide the cars from the street. He pointed out the planned parking garage with two levels and the outdoor deck for future occupants on the third level.

He explained the cross sections provided in the packet, drawing attention to the heights of Ginger and Baker and the new Millhouse, which is four stories. He discussed the proposed buildings in relation to the neighboring buildings, such as Ginger and Baker, the machine shop and the Depot, pointing out the areas where the buildings are stepped down, and set back.

He talked how the design relates to the adjacent buildings in materials, texture and pattern. He discussed breaking up the mass of the façade along Willow, and how it mimics the size of the machine shop in terms of width.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Hogestad asked Ms. Bzdek if any part of the Feeder Supply property is within the 200' area of adjacency. She pointed out where the property boundary touches the buffer area. Mr. Hogestad said he believed the Feeder Supply should be included in the area of adjacency, noting that it offers a lot of architectural clues.

Ms. Simpson asked for clarification about the cross section showing the offsets from the right-of-way line. Mr. Illanes said the offset was measured from the main façade.

Mr. Bello asked about the lap siding that was mentioned as a nod to the residential buildings. Mr. Illanes pointed out its location on the back side of the building.

Chair Dunn asked if any of the houses on Pine were eligible, noting that they are located outside the buffer at Poudre and Pine. Ms. Bzdek was uncertain about the eligibility of those houses.

Mr. Murray commented that the sign shop was brick, and said he thought the houses on Pine were wood frame.

Mr. Hogestad asked the Applicant to explain the different materials and the systems used, and how they are attached. Mr. Illanes described the various materials. In response to another question from Mr. Hogestad, he said the brick was "true brick" and the cement panels are a rainscreen system.

Mr. Murray asked how the building connects to Giddings and Union Pacific. Mr. Illanes explained that the top of the brick is the same as what is across the street. Chair Dunn noted that the building recesses back on Willow to reference Giddings, and asked how it is set back to reference the Depot. Mr. Illanes said that based on the guidelines in Section 4.17, the reference is to Willow Street, not to the Depot. However, he noted that the massing is reduced at the ends of the building on the Depot side.

Mr. Hogestad asked for details about the lap siding. Mr. Illanes said it was cement board, and described the panels. Mr. Hogestad commented on the lack of grounding for the brick, stating that it doesn't address the historic building and ignores the character of brick. He added that if it were a thin veneer, it might work, but this is a big heavy band in full width brick with no visible means of support.

Ms. Simpson asked the Applicant to expand on his concept of pushing the first level back from the right-of-way. Mr. Illanes responded by explaining the code requires a setback at the third level on the street sides or the river front, but does not specify how far back. He said the first floor is recessed back so that it feels a like porch for the occupants. Ms. Simpson said the shadow line makes the brick look more daunting.

Mr. Hogestad noted that the recessed ground level is problematic and is a programmatic element rather than responding to anything historic. He suggested the building could push back or scale down to allow more room for patios and soften the building quite a bit.

Mr. Bello probed for more insight about the grounding of the brick, and asked whether square brick columns instead of the round columns might satisfy Mr. Hogestad's concerns. Mr. Hogestad explained that there is historic precedent for how brick is handled, how it meets grade, and how it is an extension of the load bearing brick wall. Mr. Illanes asked if he would rather have the brick wall come to the ground for the purpose of historical reference. Mr. Hogestad answered in the affirmative, and noted that the examples of brick buildings used in the presentation are like that. Mr. Bello asked whether more substantial brick columns might satisfy that need. Mr. Hogestad said that might be something to look at, but he was not offering a solution.

Ms. Wallace asked how the design shows sensitivity to the height of the historic buildings per Section 3.4.7. Mr. Illanes explained how the design complies with Section 4.17 which allows for 5 stories and requires the building to be set back from the street. Chair Dunn commented that while the setback on the 4th story may match Giddings, there is no reference to the Depot in terms of height. Mr. Illanes mentioned that the machine shop was 38' and the Depot was 42'4" at its highest point. Mr. Bello commented that there may be two conflicting historic building heights to reference. Chair Dunn said

the predominant height of the Depot is 25'8", but the gable reaches to 42', and commented that they really aren't that different in comparison to 65' for the new construction. Mr. Hogestad suggested that a more significant stepback might help to mitigate that. He also suggested something in the architecture, possibly a material change or change in planes, would help indicate the rhythm of historic building fronts which is lacking.

Chair Dunn brought up building width as discussed in Section 3.4.7(f). She noted that the building to the northeast of Pine Street approximates the width of historic buildings, but the building to the southwest of Pine Street is quite wide compared to Giddings, which the brick ribbon accentuates rather than mitigates.

Mr. Hogestad said typical historic windows are taller than they are wide, and recommended reconsidering the proportion of the windows to be more vertical, based on the requirements of Section 3.4.7. He also requested a section showing the relationship between the rainscreen and the windows.

Chair Dunn asked Mr. Illanes to address maintaining the pattern of primary entrances per 3.4.7(f)2. Mr. Illanes explained that the building gateway is in the space between the buildings, connected by a pocket park. Chair Dunn requested a better view of the doors, noting that historic buildings have a very clear entrance and that Section 3.4.7(f)2 states the pattern of entrances facing the street shall be maintained.

Chair Dunn reviewed Section 3.4.7(f)3, and commented that brick is the primary material on the adjacent historic buildings, but is not primary on this. Mr. Illanes noted that the guidelines for the district allow a diversity of materials, and this design breaks up the mass by breaking up the materiality. Mr. Hogestad noted that the Commission is looking at the Land Use Code, not the suggested guidelines for the district.

Chair Dunn referred to the Code language requiring that new construction maintain the existing distribution of materials in the same block. Chair Dunn noted that Giddings, the Depot and Ginger & Baker are all brick. Mr. Illanes talked about referencing the white color of the materials, and ground level light masonry, adding that it is very challenging to do an all brick building. Chair Dunn clarified that brick should be the dominant material.

Mr. Bello asked if it was enough to reference the white brick by color. Chair Dunn talked about the scale of brick versus cement board. Mr. Illanes asked if using a different rhythm of smaller scale would suffice. Mr. Hogestad said they need to find a human scale. Mr. Illanes asked whether human scale was most important at the pedestrian level. Mr. Hogestad said some of the panels could be broken into a scale more closely resembling masonry.

Chair Dunn pointed out there is no brick on the back of the building to relate to the Depot. Mr. Illanes mentioned that the parking structure is on that side because of the train, and the material there is cement board. He said the panel could be broken into more of a brick scale.

Ms. Simpson commented that the rendering facing south has a lot more variation and is more broken up, making that side more inviting. Mr. Hogestad said that side relates more to the historic module. He mentioned again that the unsupported brick is unsettling, but clarified that he isn't suggesting a colonnade, just that the brick needs to be grounded so it looks like it is bearing some weight.

Mr. Bello agreed that the more visible side is disappointing in terms of human scale. Mr. Illanes interpreted these comments as direction to play with the materiality and make the back more similar to the front. Mr. Bello clarified it should be similar in terms of colors and materials. Ms. Dorn said the back of the building was a good opportunity to reference the Depot with materials and height, but also in terms of breaking up materials. Ms. Gensmer mentioned that the dark gray color behind the Depot feels like a fortress, and suggested keeping color in mind as they play with the materials.

Ms. Wallace noted that the prominent elevation in the rear serves as an introduction to the River District, and she would like to see more creativity in the design. Mr. Illanes mentioned that the River District is agricultural and industrial, using a lot of metal, which is encouraged in guidelines. Chair Dunn reminded Mr. Illanes that the Commission is only concerned with the historic buildings.

Ms. Simpson said using corten or other materials could make the buildings feel warmer. She also said, while she thinks they can make improvements with setbacks and massing in terms of height and form, she appreciated that they created three individual pieces, which makes the overall scale smaller. Chair Dunn said she was glad to see Pine Street included.

Mr. Hogestad said aside from setbacks, there is no modulation of the height of the buildings, which would reduce the horizontal, bunker effect on the front of the building. He also agreed with previous comments that the dark gray color on the back doesn't help.

Chair Dunn summarized the Commissions comments as follows:

- The brick wall should come to ground in some way.
- There should be a more significant setback.
- There should be some modulation to mimic the width of the Giddings building.
- The window proportions should have more verticality.
- Consider materiality.

Ms. Simpson suggested including comments about the height. Mr. Hogestad said the modulation of the parapet, and stepping of buildings, would speak to the height. Chair Dunn agreed that modulation and other things could moderate the height.

Mr. Illanes thanked the Commission for their comments.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn explained that Staff has written a letter in support of the Colorado State Tax Credits for the Commission to consider sending. Chair Dunn read the letter to the Commission. Chair Dunn said encouraged the members to also send letters as individuals. Members supported sending the letter.

Chair Dunn shared that Historic Larimer County will be showing "The Greenest Building" which talks about LEED certification and historic buildings.

● **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 16 May 2018.



Meg Dunn, Chair